

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary**

Claims 1-42 are pending and stand rejected. Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection.

### **Rejection of Claims**

Claim 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowse et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0072935) in view of Montagna et al. (U.S. Patent 4,899,292). The rejection is traversed because Rowse is not properly prior art under 35 USC 102(e). It is noted that Rowse was filed on February 27, 2002, which is after the filing date of the present application. However, it appears that Rowse was cited because Rowse claims priority as a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Applications 09/547,661 and 09/547,650, both filed on April 12, 2000.

As noted below, Applicants respectfully submit that certain portions of Rowse relied upon for these rejections are not supported by either of the priority applications. Accordingly, Rowse is not entitled to the priority dates under 35 USC 102(e), and therefore should be removed as prior art against this application.

The undersigned attorney compared Rowse with the as-filed priority applications that are available on the electronic image file wrapper on PAIR. Paragraphs 0043-0044 disclose a firewall system not disclosed in the parent applications. Paragraph 0078 is the last substantive paragraph of the parent applications included in Rowse. Paragraphs 0077 and 0079-0106 are new paragraphs not found in the parent applications. Additionally, FIGS. 20a, 20b, 21 and 22 have been added in Rowse, and these new figures are described at least in new paragraphs 0079-0080, 0086-0087, 0093-0101. Applicants point out below for each rejected claim the relied upon portions of Rowse which are not entitled to priority and thus are not prior art to the present claims.

Independent Claim 1: Specifically, Paragraphs 0043-0044, 0086-0087 and 0094-0097 of Rowse are relied upon in the rejection. The parent application arguably discloses storing data on a host server (the reason paragraphs 0043-0044 are cited). However, the substance of paragraphs 0086-0087 and 0094-0097 was not found in the parent applications of Rowse. Accordingly, the rejection against claim 1 is requested to be withdrawn.

Claim 2: Specifically, Paragraph 0078 of Rowse is relied upon in the rejection. However, Claim 2 claims dependency from Claim 1 and as such contains all the limitations of Claim 1. For the above reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that Claim 2 now overcomes the rejection.

Claims 3-5, 13 and 14: Specifically, Paragraphs 0043-0044 of Rowse are relied upon in the rejection. The substance of Paragraph 0043-0044, as it is best understood to be applied to these claims, was not found in the parent applications of Rowse. Moreover, these cited paragraphs do not disclose the recited claim limitations. For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8: Specifically, Paragraphs 0076-0080 of Rowse are relied upon for these rejections. However, the substance of Paragraphs 0077 and 0079-0080 is not found in the parent applications. Moreover, paragraph 0079 describes Figures 20a and 20b, which present new material not disclosed in the parent applications of Rowse. For at least this reason, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12: Specifically, Paragraphs 0093-0101 are relied upon for the rejection of these claims. The substance of Paragraphs 0093-0101 is not found in the parent applications. Moreover, these paragraphs describe Figures 21a and b and 22, which are also not disclosed in the parent applications. For at least this reason, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 15: Specifically, Paragraphs 0043-0044, 0086-0087 and 0094-0097 are relied upon for the rejection of this claim. The parent application arguably discloses storing data on a host server (the reason paragraphs 0043-0044 are

Serial No. 09/667,611  
Response dated September 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 15, 2004

cited). However, the substance of Paragraphs 0086-0087 and 0094-0097 are not found in the parent applications of Rowse. For at least this reason, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 29: Specifically, Paragraphs 0043-0044, and 0086-0087 are relied upon by the rejection of this claim. The parent applications arguably disclose storing data on a host server (the reason paragraphs 0043-0044 are cited). However, the substance of Paragraphs 0086-0087 is not found in the parent applications of Rowse. For at least this reason, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 16-42: The rejections of these claims rely upon the rejection of underlying process of claims 2-14. However, as noted above, the cited subject matter of Rowse for claims 2-14 is not found in the parent applications of Rowse. For at least this reason, the rejections should be withdrawn.

## **Conclusion**

In view of this response, Assignee respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks an early allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen C. Smith  
Registration No. 53,617  
Attorney for Assignee

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200